

THE outgoing dozen of London's diplomatic corps, M. Massigli began last week in a series of speeches and receptions, the task of what Americans south of the Mason-Dixon line would call "telling his good-byes."

London has never been what is termed a "diplomatic capital," and the Ambassadors who have succeeded in making a special place for themselves there have been exceedingly few and far between.

The end of the Massigli's mission thus brings to a regretted close an unusual chapter in English social life. I use the plural advisedly. For if there is undoubtedly a sensitive and intelligent friendliness to be found by those who care to dig for it beneath M. Massigli's inscrutable exterior and his nervous and sometimes unintelligible conversations, it is his wife.

With the memorable warmth of her energetic, gay, and unaffected personality, her great talents as a hostess and her admirable capacity for true friendship, she deserves the principal credit for making the French Embassy something it has never been before and will not easily be made again, one of the most hospitable houses in London and the most agreeable rendezvous imaginable for sociable Britons of every sort of opinion and accomplishment.

## One Of Us

ENGLISH people may be slow to take foreigners to their hearts, but when they do, it is for all time. Madame Massigli will be welcome in London and counted "one of us" for the rest of her life.

Her husband now goes to become the direction of this country's Foreign Office as a new period in French history.

Already he has been building up a French diplomatic team to meet the new look in French politics at least for as long as it lasts in fashion. One of his duties is a chronic one within the existing French system, that when permits French Civil servants at home and abroad to pursue their own political interests in a manner which would be inconceivable in

arguing last week in favour of greater secrecy in diplomacy, and the experiences of the Western world since President Wilson's day certainly confirm his view.

It is no secret, however, that for the greater part of his London mission, M. Massigli found himself in disagreement with much of his Government's foreign policy.

Listening to some of the opinions he vouchsafed to British people over the years, a French person, unaware of his identity, might have taken him less for his country's Ambassador than for a foreigner rather harsh and unfair in his judgment of French statesmanship.

By the same token, M. Massigli has rather short-temperedly and short-sightedly, accused of Francophobia persons long-pledged by friendship and kinship with his country who have continued loyal to its great post-war political and diplomatic initiative now abandoned.

## Welcomed By All

HE has demanded of English people for his present hero and master, M. Mendès-France, a degree of uncritical admiration that was noticeably absent from his own attitude to M. Mendès-France's predecessors.

It is a fact of course, though M. Massigli may have forgotten it, that M. Mendès-France's unexpected accession to power was welcomed by all informed Britons without exception.

Furthermore, English supporters of the European policies which M. Massigli and some of his Quai d'Orsay colleagues as long as succeeded in burying, have found themselves in agreement with M. Robert Schuman and other "good losers" in the French Assembly who do not want to oppose the Paris agreements, but prefer to "recall our minor faults."

One hopes that M. Massigli will not, like it is an unwarrantable interference in French internal politics to say that, nobody in British wants to see M. Mendès-France brought down.

There is far too much that is to be said for France that

soon as possible. And if he is only half the "superman" Mr. Dulles has dubbed him, he still possesses more determination than that of most of his predecessors put together.

It is true that General de Gaulle, who despises M. Mendès-France less than any other of his fellow politicians and gives him as much grudging support as he can summon, has said that not even Napoleon or Richelieu could succeed in governing France under the present system.

It would not be possible for France's Premier to get anything done at all without some pretty devious stratagems for the squaring of supporters and opponents alike.

The tactics that are permissible in legislatures like the French Assembly are out of place in alliances like NATO and more out of place still within the Entente Cordiale which M. Mendès-France never tires of telling us is the basis of his European policy.

M. Massigli can hardly have failed to report to his chief last week the considerable disquiet and suspicion aroused in Whitehall by recent developments in French policy. His speech at the United Nations had already caused an unpleasant surprise.

The unilateral *démarche* to Moscow over the Austrian treaty has aroused further suspicion that M. Mendès-France's "parallel" policy is leading somewhere very different from the goal of NATO policy.

## Bribe For Approval

IT is fair to say that in a Machiavellian sense at least, the suspicions that have been aroused in London stand to help rather than hinder the chances of ratification of the Paris agreements next week, it being the case that French nationalists and neutralists judge the worth of a given policy on its capacity to bribe France's allies and please Moscow.

M. Mendès-France clearly judged that his one hope of avoiding the sort of dropping conditional ratification of the agreement sought by the Gauls would be to take a few bold independent steps along the

of the agreements and at the risk of shocking his allies.

He may have been right. But the fact that there is no evidence whatsoever that the Russians have any intention of relaxing their hold on Eastern Germany in the foreseeable future does not preclude the possibility of their playing with the French initiative on Austria in a manner which could greatly weaken chances of French ratification. The coming week will show.

But the precedent that has been set for the taking of independent initiative towards Moscow by Powers whose diplomacy in order to be successful should be concerted at every turn is a thoroughly bad one.

As Sir Anthony Eden has said, we shall not get any understanding with the East until we have "stability and cohesion purpose in the West."

## Stumbling Block

WE shall not get it if there is to be a continuation of the sort of nationalist-inspired, diplomatic manoeuvres which are so dangerously favoured by the loose alliance which the Paris agreements have put in E.D.C. shoes.

The otherwise rather quietly complacent details which I listened to at Strasbourg last week showed that the absence of supranationalism in the Paris agreements may well cause the Saar problem to be the stumbling block to their ratification.

In those debates I was told by an African, a Socialist Deputy, M. Senghor, a Christian and a Socialist—taken a cry from the "heaven" which though it was principally addressed to Paris, equally deserved to be heeded in London.

The truth is, the past and last week's headlines simply confirmed his words: that the narrow, anti-historical, anti-Nationalism is triumphant once again. The truth is, that before the ratification of the Paris agreements, the leadership of Western Europe is being displaced.

It is reasonable to say that at a time when Asia is stirring up her strength and Africa is stirring into war, Europe should concentrate